see that makes the work all alike, evens it up, no one has more to do than another, and it comes out exactly even in the end, every one judged, and none left unjudged. "Let a man judge himself that he be not judged." HIMSELF, is the man that we must judge, and no other, and the man that will properly govern and judge himself will find that he has just exactly enough to do, he really could not do any more right if he would try. And the man that sees himself as he really is, and governs and judges himself, does not want to judge or govern any one else, indeed he would not do it, for he would not know that he would have much to do—he could do either case justice. I feel safe to say, that if we were to teach the individual responsibility, and self-government, instead of church government, we would come nearer teaching the truth.

However, these scriptures that I have used are generally supposed to apply to the individual and not to the church. I would ask why? There is no Scripture to give such a supposition, and why should anything apply to an individual that will not apply to the church? What is the church but an aggregation of individuals, and how could the church be better or worse than the indviduals that compose it—impossible. Then our text applies to the individual, or to the church either, for I am very sure that what it says to the church it says to the individual.

I am not here to say that we do not need a system of church goverenment at all. I do not want to be understood that way, but I do say the more individual government we have, the less we will have to do in a church capacity, and as a rule, church government means force rule, and I want to know if any body ever knew any body to be made better by force. If you cannot save people without force, you cannot save them with it I am very certain; then what is force rule worth? If you cannot persuade people to love God and do right please Him, you cannot save them by affrighting them about hell-fire. Then if suasion is the only rule that will work in point of salvation, why not begin with it at once, and persuade every Christian to govern themselves, and there-by save any trouble on that point whatever. Our text says "Let your moderation be known unto all men." Is this addressed to the church, or to the saints at Philippi collectively, or individually? It is my impression that all will agree that it will best apply to them individually. Then Paul's counsel to the individual is to be moderate in all things, and if each individual is moderate in all things, it is a plain case that the church will be also, and nothing more is necessary on this point. Now I come to consider the text more properly—Moderation is the grandest feature of life, Paul knew it, men know it today, yet it is seldom so taught. But is compulsory moderation of any consequence? Is compulsion anything less than punishment in a degree? Does punishment elevate and ennoble? If not forced moderation is worse than worthless, it does not make a whit better, it cannot add anything to Christian character, and hence it is entirely worthless, unless exercised by our own volition. Paul does not speak of moderation in reference to any particular thing, hence we must conclude he had reference to everything. Of what value would it be for a Christian to be moderate in one thing only. Suppose he was moderate in dress, but very immoderate in, or excessive, or extravagant in every thing else, would that make him a Christian? If so, then moderation in dress is the only condition of salvation. But suppose a man is disposed to be immoderate, or extravagant in dress, and in order to check and control him in that matter we go to work to restrain him in that particular, and make a limit, beyond which he shall not pass. Out of respect to all concerned he may respect the limit, but is his heart in it? does he take pleasure in the restriction? Remove it and mark his conduct, see the change—Now what is it worth to any body? But if we had a right to lay a restriction on the man's dress, why have we not the same right to lay it on his tongue, and on his trade, on his politics, on his eating, his drinking, and on his finances.

Now for the sake of moderation, we lay a restriction on a man's dress, but we let him talk all he wants to, he can joke as much and laugh as loud as he wishes, he can gormandize to his heart's content, he can quarrel about politics as much as he please, he can drive as many sharp bargains as he can, and make all the money he can. by any means he may contrive, and keep all he gets. Now who would not say that this was a very foolish proceeding, especially when done in the name of religion. If we have a right, for the sake of moderation, to lay a restriction on one thing, we have an equal right to lay it on all. If we have no right to lay it on all, we have no right to lay it on any one. If we lay a restriction on one for the purpose of bettering the condition, we make that one the sole condition of being made better, and that is neither logical nor right.

With these facts before us, I feel safe to say that there is but one way, but one safe and sure way to inculcate moderation, that will benefit, for forced moderation cannot benefit—and that way is to teach it instead of forcing it, bring the subject, I mean the individual to an intelligent understanding of the proper thing to do, and there is little doubt but what they will do it. The Christian does not desire immoderation, or excess in dress any more than in anything else. The persons that is immoderate in work, in speculation, in talk, in eating, in politics, in dress, or in anything else, is at variance with our text. But if we can just get each individual to keep themselves in the bounds of reasonable moderation, we will have the most moderate body of Christians that can be found, but if you cannot persuade the individual to bring themselves under subjection in this matter, pray tell how you will do it? We have already noticed that compulsion is of no value whatever. And if Bible teaching will not effect the individual, it simply comes short of its purpose—and I am very certain that human legislation, and force will not effect the body.

Now if the individuals will each undertake to govern and control themselves, in all things, and will do it, there will be little trouble, or little reason for church government, as respects the individual conduct of the members. Then the entire body will be moderate, self-governed, and Christian.

If this is not the purpose of Christ as delineated in the Gospel I fail to comprehend properly. Christ taught plainly that "ye cannot serve two masters," and until I believe that the church is infallible, I shall not believe that it has any right to lay down a rule to govern one individual by, outside the Bible, and if it is in the Bible, we need nothing of an addition made by man. If the Gospel is not a perfect plan of salvation, it bears falsity upon its face, and cannot save, and then what could poor erring man add, NOTHING. In closing let me entreat all, to govern themselves, and then the church will be governed. Each one keep themselves in the bounds of moderation, and the church will be inside the line of moderation. We must talk, we must eat, we must work, make money and wear clothes, let all be done with moderation, and we will be accepted by Christ.

Olathe, Kan.

Roll Away the Stone.

BY JOSEPH F MILLER.

Jesus said take, ye away the stone. St. John 11:39.

Dear brothren and sisters, I think that if I could have been Martha or Mary when Jesus said, take ye away the stone, I would have rejoiced with the expectation of seeing Him perform some miracle as He had oftimes done before. Dear brethren I believe that they removed the stone as soon as Christ bid them do so. How many of us today have a stone of some kind lying before us that Jesus says remove, and still we let it lay. I wish in particular to speak of some of our duties to our God. How often are we called on to perform some duty and we see some kind of a stone lying in the way. There are many kinds of stone, and one that we so often see and hear of is this stone called I can't. Jesus says roll ye away the stone! I have heard so much of this stone called, I can't, that I have become disgusted at it. Roll ye away the stone. If we can do it no other way let us go to prayer and ask God to help us remove the stone. He has promised to help us if we ask in faith; roll ye away the stone.

We will take for instance our social Prayer meeting; oftimes a brother is asked to lead the meeting or read a chapter, or to lead in prayer and the first thing he will say is I can't. We ask him why can you not do so? I am afraid I will break down. Roll ye away the stone! I think this is folly. Where is there a brother who has the love of Jesus in his heart who can not kneel down and give God the thanks for what he has done for us and ask him still to help us to forward the cause of Christ. This is enough if done with the right motive. Roll ye away the stone! Let the world laugh! they laughed at Jesus. I believe there is too much praying to people. I say let us throw away the world and worldly things, and think of nothing but Jesus and him crucified. Jesus says, roll ye away the stone! Let us go at it whole hearted, and sure that Jesus will help to roll away the stone, which is called I can't. Let us no longer sit back with this stone in the way, but let us put our shoulder to the wheel and push on the Gospel car. Roll ye away the stone! Give me one good volunteer soldier for Christ, and I will back more of the enemy than you can with double the number that must be pushed in the ranks or that you must stay behind with the bayonet to keep them in there places. So I would say in conclusion, let us quit saying, I can't, and put on the armor of Christ, and help push on His cause for what he has done for us on Calvary. Let us hold higher the banner of Christ and rally around the cross, so that when our Pilgrimage is over here and Jesus shall come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, that we may be numbered with those that shall hear the welcome words, come ye blessed of my father inherit the mansions prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

Col. of St. James, Md.

The Immortality of the Soul.

While looking over some back numbers of the EVAGELIST today, I notice in number 28 that Brother J. B. Lair is beginning to steer his boat in the right direction relative to the immortality of the soul. If we could only learn that the "wages of sin is death," (not life in hell)it would not take long to understand why "the soul that sinneth shall die." If the Brethren church really sets herself up as holding to the doctrine of "the immortality of the soul," I don't wish to be included as one of its members, for I don't believe any such anti-bible stuff. Who, in the name of sense ever read of the dissolution or "dividing asunder" of soul and body? True Paul speaks of the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, but not a word of soul and body. That the body within itself has no life is evident, it is the soul (life) that lives in the body that makes the body act. This life (soul) was produced by the breath (spirit, life principle) of God, and when God takes away the breath (spirit of life) the soul(life) must as a consequence cease, and the "spirit (breath) goes to God who gave it." When the soul(life)ceases to live in the body the body must also cease to act, and must return to the original condition i. e. "Man, made of the dust of the ground," having no life (soul) and therefore must be inactive (lifeless) until He, who is the resurrection (revival from the dead, not the calling back from heaven or hell)and the life,(soul, being,)shall call us by means of the spirit, (breath of life)into existence(soul, life.) again. But I must stop here, and will stop my belief entirely on this theme if any body will just point out one, just one will do, passage of scripture that teaches that man gets his immortality at birth into this world, or that we are immortal in the present state of existence.—J. H. S.

Patient waiting is often the highest way of doing God's will.—COLLIER.

The great fact is that life is a service. The only question is, whom will we serve?—FABER.

Sometimes it is hard to tell whether a man is firm in principle or simply obstinate; but the man himself never expresses any doubt.
—JOURNAL OF EDUCATION.

He that hath no bridle on his tongue hath no grace in his heart.—ST. JEROME.